UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,835	03/17/2005	Jason Daniel Harold O'Connor	2135-00500	2402
23505 7590 08/06/2007 CONLEY ROSE, P.C.		EXAMINER .		
David A. Rose			RALIS, STEPHEN J	
P. O. BOX 326 HOUSTON, T			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1.000101., 1117, 1200 0207			3742	
		·		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/521,835	O'CONNOR, JASON DANIEL HAROLD			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Stephen J. Ralis	3742			

	Stephen J. Ralis	3742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date	-	to the field outside in				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final reject	ion.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS	,	(,-				
3. A The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TE below);				
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li> </ul>		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		•				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:		•				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5 and 7-9</u> .		•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.			
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					
13. Souther: See Continuation Sheet.						
	·					
	•					
		•				

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitations of at least " the heating wire remaining free of contact with the conductor encased in the PTC material sheath" in independent claim 10 and dependent claims 11-15 have not been previously presented and would require further consideration and/or a new search.

Similarly, the limitation of at least "a semi-conductor heating element extending along the cable, the two conductors being embedded and completely surrounded by the semi-conductor heating element such that the semi-conductor heating element is in electrical contact with each conductor and remains free of contact with the each conductor encased in a PTC material sheath" recited in independent claim 16 and dependent claims 17-20 have not been previously presented and would require further consideration and/or a new search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument based upon the age of the references, contentions that the reference patents are old are not impressive absent a showing that the art tried and failed to solve the same problem notwithstanding its presumed knowledge of the references. See In re Wright, 569 F.2d 1124, 193 USPQ 332 (CCPA 1977).

Continuation of 13. Other: The examiner notes, for the record, that the last Office action was inadvertently labeled a "non-final" Office Action. The examiner further notes, for the record, that the "Conclusion" section on page 9 of the prior Office Action respectfully states, "THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL". Therefore, the prior Office Action is deemed "FINAL".

TUBA HOANG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER